UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,682	02/01/2001	Motoshi Asano	SON-2024	3648
	7590 06/23/200 MAN & GRAUER PLI	EXAMINER		
LION BUILDIN		POINVIL, FRANTZY		
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3692	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/774,682	ASANO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Frantzy Poinvil	3692	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears or	the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICAT	ION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
	: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the h appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that 	Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In n SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. LY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee ed statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance	hereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but print (a) They raise new issues that would require further considers (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form 	ation and/or search (see NOTE below);
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corres NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	ponding number of finally rejected claims.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. Se	e attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable non-allowable claim(s). 	e if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided to the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,4 and 9-38</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>None</u> .	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Noti entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcor showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was a sufficient reasons.	ne <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the	e status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does See Continuation Sheet.	NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/S13. ☐ Other:	SB/08) Paper No(s)
	/Frantzy Poinvil/
	Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3692

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the applicant is referred to the prior Office action.